DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 327 UD 012 097

TITLE	ESEA Title I Evaluation: Summary Report.
INSTITUTION	Saint Louis Board of Education, Mo.
PUB DATE	Nov 71
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Class Size; *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Education; High Schools; Individualized Instruction; Inservice Programs; Opportunity Classes; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Reading Programs; Secondary Education; Vocational Education; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Missouri

ABSTRACT

Presented here are summaries of the evaluations of major Title I, ESEA instructional programs conducted during 1970-71 in the St. Louis city schools. In the "Rooms of 20" program, elementary school students attend school in ungraded classrooms of no more than 20 students. One teacher works with each class, and students and teachers concentrate on reading, language, and arithmetic. The Remedial Teachers program serves Title I students having the most severe reading problems. The Work-Study High School program provides an opportunity for vocational training and work experience to students who are otherwise prone to drop out of school altogether. Lincoln Opportunity High School is for students suspended from their regular high school for behavior which disrupted regular classroom proceedings, or their inability to succeed academically because of inadequate learning skills or motivation. The Mini-Grant component provides small grants to individual Title I schools to aid faculties in solving their instructional problems and to provide demonstrations for other schools with similar problems. Two distinct inservice training programs were conducted under the Title I inservice component. One was a massive program of workshops called Springboard, while the other consisted of three district wide and six school level programs. (Author/JM)

ED 059327

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
SUMMARY REPORT

November, 1971

Ernest Jones, Acting Superintendent
St. Louis Board of Education

Division of Evaluation and Research
1517 S. Theresa Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63104
(314) 865-4550

UD 012097

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iv
Rooms of Twenty	1
Remedial Teachers	5
Work-Study High School	8
Lincoln High School	13
Mini-Grants	17
Inservice Training	21
Summer School	26

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

These summaries are based upon extensive program evaluations conducted by the following people: Margaret Houlihan, Rooms of Twenty Program and Remedial Teachers; Ida Schaeffer and Joseph Schaefer, Mini-Grants; Jerry Powers, Lincoln High School and Work-Study High School, James Crawford and James Wooten, Inservice; Jean Jose, Leonard Evans, and Frances Goff, Summer School. A number of other people--Dorothy M. Pillman, Coordinator, Title I Evaluation, Gerald H. Moeller, Director, Evaluation and Research, and Arthur G. Draper, helped with reactions and suggestions. Peggy MacKenzie designed the cover. Jeanne Drane edited the report.

PREFACE

Presented here are summaries of the evaluations of major Title I instructional programs conducted during 1970-71 in the St. Louis city schools. The information they contain includes the number of children served, a description of the program operations, a statement of goals and objectives, and the results achieved. We have tried to present the significant facts briefly and straightforwardly, and hopefully, nothing important has been omitted in the process of selecting and summarizing the information provided by the program evaluations. Those who wish to see the complete Title I evaluation may do so by contacting the Division of Evaluation and Research.

There has been much moving, shifting, and settling of emphasis in Title I programs on local, state, and federal levels, since the 1970-71 school year began. The main objective continues to be raising the educational level of economically and educationally deprived children. However, there have been some changes in the means by which we hope to reach this objective. This, of course, has meant changes in the programs.

We have learned from both our successes and our failures during the five years of Title I. One of the things we have learned is that severely retarded readers can improve their reading under the type of supportive and prescriptive instruction provided by Rooms of Twenty and Remedial Reading Teachers. Having mastered the skill of reading, these students continue to achieve when they return to the regular classroom. We have also seen certain instructional techniques and materials work better than others. In line with this, the Rooms of Twenty, Remedial Reading Teachers, and the inservice programs have been significantly altered. The Rooms of Twenty has been changed to Rooms of Fifteen, allowing for even closer pupil-teacher contact.

The Remedial Reading Teacher program has evolved into a massive, coordinated program of Reading Improvement Teams. Former remedial teachers will now be a part of a team of Title I classroom teachers, reading aides, and volunteers, under the direction of a Title I reading assistant. The Reading Improvement Teams will concentrate only on achieving and measuring reading improvement for each child in the program. All RIT personnel will receive extensive inservice training through the District Title I Curriculum Specialist and a Title I Inservice Coordinator. The Title I Inservice Coordinator is a new resource built into the RIT program as a result of the concern for concentrating resources upon reading improvement. However, the RIT staff will decide what training they need. RIT's will also receive the services of a Title I volunteer coordinator and Title I psychological examiners, social workers, and counselors. This new design for improving reading represents a move, desired both locally and by the ESEA Title I officials, toward concentrating personnel and resources upon the areas of greatest need.

Inservice training will be another priority emphasis during 1971-72. Prior to the Springboard Inservice experience this past spring and summer, inservice had been largely the uncoordinated, private affair of each program and often was more orientation than training. Springboard, however, demonstrated both the diversity of inservice needs and interests throughout all Title I areas and a tremendous eagerness of teachers for training. If teachers are to be held accountable for the results they achieve with their students, they must have the training they require as the need for it arises. Title I children have special needs and a variety of special teaching skills are required for meeting these needs.

Another area of emphasis will be increased involvement of teachers in establishing program objectives and making decisions about their

instructional and testing programs. Teachers want and need the freedom to experiment with different methods and materials in their classrooms until they find a successful instructional approach for every student they teach. Teachers also want and need more realistic means of measuring the achievement of their students. Hopefully, during the 1971-72 school year teachers can begin to develop good teacher-made tests and other performance measures to supplement standardized tests in evaluating student achievement. It is also hoped that feedback from students' self-assessment and program assessment can be used to provide guidance for their future learning.

In outlining our hopes for 1971-72 a few words regarding administrative and financial matters seem appropriate. Since Title I was initiated in 1965, the number of poor children in the city has increased astronomically. In the span of five years the ADC rate has gone from one in seven to one in three of the city schools' children. Despite this and despite the deep inroads of inflation the schools actually will receive less money in 1971-72 than they did in 1965-66.

In April, 1971, an administrative change forced us to serve no more than 20,000 pupils each year, despite the fact that more than 40,000 children were eligible for service in Title I areas of the city. A number of schools which were eligible for Title I service in 1965 and which doubled in ADC rate had to be withdrawn as eligible schools because other schools had increased five or six fold in poor children.

Comparability is another issue binding us. Title I funds are supposed to supplement and not supplant local efforts. The basis of control is the requirement that each Title I school be individually comparable, within a 5% margin, to the average of all non-Title I schools in per pupil expenditure and

pupil personnel ratios. This forces the school system into contradictory positions. We are engaged in decentralizing administration and involving the community in school decisions to accomodate the diversity of needs from school to school, but at the same time are required by federal guidelines to enforce uniformity of operation. We support the philosophy of individualizing instruction, but must treat all schools exactly the same, even though the needs of the students in these schools are tremendously different.

While we desire to cooperate fully with the U.S. Office of Education, we feel that their standards of comparability is unrealistic for a large urban school system. Furthermore, it would seem to undermine their own mandates for accountability and parent-community involvement. We are committed to providing a quality education to all St. Louis children and are willing to be judged by their achievement. We are indebted beyond measure to the extra help ESEA Title I has provided toward meeting the special needs of deprived children. However, it does seem necessary to protest when the policies designed to safeguard the use of public educational funds begin to work against the educational interests of the very children they are designed to serve.

ROOMS OF TWENTY

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 1,818

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: The Title I Rooms of Twenty program is for elementary school students who were not able to master the basic reading, language, and arithmetic skills in their regular classrooms. A main purpose of the program is to improve the students' skills in these basic subjects so that they can succeed in the regular classroom. Another purpose is to help them grow in self-confidence.

The 1970-71 program concentrated on improvement in the areas given priority in the 1969-70 program evaluation. The top priority was to establish performance objectives for the program. Early in the year the staff set two objectives, both of which aimed at improvement over the previous year's performance. The objectives were (1) an average composite gain in achievement of ten months during the ten month school year, as measured by a standardized test, and (2) an average student attendance rate of 94% for 1970-71. Other improvement goals included providing inservice for R/20 staff, collecting data on students' achievement before and after their participation in the program, and identifying instructional techniques in high achieving R/20 classes.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: In the Rooms of Twenty program the children attend school in ungraded classrooms of no more than twenty students. One teacher works with each class, and students and teachers concentrate on reading, language, and arithmetic. Other subjects are used as vehicles for getting these skills across.

The program is open to Title I students who are a year or more below grade level in the basic skills as measured by standardized achievement tests. However, it can only serve students of normal intelligence; a student must have an IQ of 80 or above to be eligible. Students are referred to R/20 classes by teachers and principals in the Title I schools. Although the classrooms are ungraded, there are two divisions for placement. Students working at approximately second or third grade level are placed in primary units. Those working at the fourth grade level and higher are placed in middle grade units.

There are ninety-nine Rooms of Twenty located throughout the four Title I districts in the city. Sixty-four of these are located in eight R/20 buildings with eight classrooms each. These units serve about twenty-five different schools. In addition, there are thirty-five R/20 classrooms which serve twenty-eight other schools.

As recommended in the 1969-70 evaluation, the R/20 program is now being coordinated by a supervisor who was appointed at the beginning of the 1970-71 school year to coordinate all Title I programs. Under her direction a number of innovations have been introduced including, "Direct Instruction System for Teaching" (DISTAR), published by SRA, tried experimentally in four primary R/20 classes, and "Instructional Objectives Exchange" material from U.C.L.A. tried in eight other classes. The DISTAR material involved reading, arithmetic, and language; instructional objectives from Instructional Objectives Exchange were adapted for use in the area of reading comprehension.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: Most of the improvement goals for 1970-71 were reached. The pre- and post-scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills show that middle unit students made an average projected

gain of one year and 1.4 month which surpassed the ten month objective by 1.4 months, and respresented a significant increase over the 8.0 month average gain made in R/20 in 1969-70. Results from the Metropolitan Achievement Tests used for primary unit students show a projected average composite gain of 8.7 months. This is short of the desired objective, but it does represent a 2.1 month increase over the previous year's average composite gain of 6.5 months.

The average attendance rate for all R/20 students was 93.8%. This was considered to meet the objective for 94% attendance. The previous year's attendance rate was 92.5%. R/20 classes continue to have an average attendance rate higher than the city wide average.

Two sessions of inservice training were held for R/20 staff, one at the beginning of school and another later in the fall. The first session dealt with diagnostic and remedial techniques. The second session, which consisted of four Saturday workshops, introduced innovative approaches in teaching the basic skills. An average of ninety teachers attended the training and rated it satisfactory. Observations in the classroom showed the teachers had implemented many ideas presented during inservice.

Achievement data was collected for students who had been in Rooms of Twenty during 1969-70 term but had returned to regular fifth, sixth and seventh grade classrooms for 1970-71. Comparison of the ITBS composite gain scores for the two years showed that these former R/20 students not only maintained the average learning rate of 8.0 they had achieved in the R/20 classes, but raised it to a year and 2.2 months in their regular classes. Furthermore, their average gains in 1970-71 were higher than those made city wide in the same grades. Evidently the program is meeting its

objective of enabling students to succeed in regular school environments.

The evaluator observed teachers whose classes made the highest gains to identify their teaching techniques. A Title I ESEA Educational Practices Check Sheet was used in each observation. The teaching techniques found consistently in high achieving classes, and which appear to make a difference between low and high achievement, were the following:

1. Teachers made their instructional objective clear.

2. Teachers used instructional materials imaginatively. Their methods usually involved greater verbalization by the student than by the teacher.

3. Teachers maintained a friendly, natural, even relationship with the students. They did not express either positive or negative emotions excessively.

Information on these techniques will be disseminated to other R/20 teachers and will probably form the basis for an inservice training session later on.

Teachers who used the experimental DISTAR and Instructional Objective Exchange instructional programs reported that students had responded favorably to these materials and had mastered the skills they presented. Expanded use of the two programs is planned for the 1971-72 school year.

Last year was the final year for the R/20 program as such. New Title I guidelines require the program to changed to Rooms of 15. The maximum number of students per class will be reduced to fifteen, but the structure of the program will be similar to that of the Rooms of Twenty program.

REMEDIAL TEACHERS

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 3,699

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES: The remedial teachers work with Title I students who have the most severe reading problems. The program includes students in primary grades through the ninth grade. Usually these students are a year or more below grade level in reading comprehension as indicated by standardized achievement tests.

The objective of the program is to bring remedial students to grade level competency in reading. Since reading involves many different skills, performance objectives were set by the teachers for each skill emphasized. For the elementary students they were the most basic: (1) mastery of phonics, (2) listening skills, (3) reading comprehension, and (4) positive attitude toward reading. The objectives for the high school freshmen included all these but emphasized mastery of comprehension skills and vocabulary development.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: There were seventy-three teachers in the Remedial Reading program for 1970-71. They served fifty-four Title I elementary schools and six high schools, with each teacher carrying a minimum load of fifty students. A supervisor coordinated their efforts.

The remedial reading teachers used Title I and Senate Bill 15 guidelines to identify the children to be included in the program.

Teachers at the elementary level used the same diagnostic instruments, the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs and Test of Word Perception Skills.

Formal diagnostic tools were not used at the ninth grade level.

In elementary schools, students were put into small groups of three to four students on the basis of their diagnosis. Each student received an average of 2½ hours of instruction per week from the remedial teacher. (This was in addition to reading instruction in the regular classroom.) Some teachers met with their students two or three times a week, while others worked with their students daily but for shorter periods. At the ninth grade level class size usually ranged from eight to ten students. Classes met on alternate days during a regular school period of approximately forty-five minutes.

The remedial teachers employed both the old and simple methods of flash cards and reading games as well as new and sophisticated techniques and materials such as controlled reading machines, reading kits, and new reading series for recreational reading. The Readers Digest Skill Builders, the Dolch word list, and Dr. Spello filmstrips were used, as were a variety of other materials and books. Machines were used only when they filled a definite purpose.

In addition to their work connected directly with teaching reading, the remedial teachers gave diagnostic and achievement tests to new students entering the schools. They also met as a group with the evaluator for feedback and planning.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: The gains made by the students were measured by standardized tests administered at the beginning and the end of the program. The Gates-McGinitie Reading test was used with primary level students and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills was used for fourth grade and above. The results showed students at each level

made average gains in reading comprehension that exceeded a year's gain in a year of instruction. Also, the average gains in reading comprehension made by remedial students in grades four through eight were greater than the average gains made city-wide. A total of 377 primary remedial students made an average gain of one year and .5 months, and a total of 1,995 fourth through ninth graders showed an average gain of one year and 1.7 months. Even though these scores indicate considerable progress, these students still are reading well below their grade expectancy and need to make more improvement in order to catch up.

Remedial reading is one of the programs extensively altered by new Title I guidelines. It has been developed into a massive coordinated program of Reading Improvement Teams. Each team consists of a reading assistant, a remedial teacher, ten Title I classroom teachers, reading aides, and volunteers. The principal of the school which the team serves is also part of each team. The reading assistant, which is a new position, will assist classroom teachers to improve the teaching of reading, including diagnosis and prescription. He also will direct the reading aides in prescribed instructional activities with students and coordinate the entire team program, including inservice for RIT personnel. An inservice coordinator has been employed to work with the RIT's. The remedial reading teacher will continue to work individually with fifty to a hundred students with the most serious reading problems. Reading aides will work with pupils following carefully prescribed learning plans under the direction of the reading assistant. All Title I aides have been designated reading aides. It is expected that each RIT will be responsible, on the average, for almost 210 students.

WORK-STUDY

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 300

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: Work-Study High School provides an opportunity for vocational training and work experience to students who are otherwise prone to drop out of school altogether. It strives to be a viable alternative for these students to the traditional academic education, not merely a substitute for it.

The primary objectives of WSHS are: (1) to provide students instruction and experience in occupational skills,(2) to teach them English, social studies, and mathmetics by relating these subjects to their work areas, and (3) to alleviate personal problems and develop positive work attitudes through counseling and social work activities. Other formally stated goals include recruiting drop-out prone students, keeping them in school until graduation, and providing them job experience through part-time jobs while in school. The program tries to supplement students' training by providing a variety of multi-media material in a Media Center and by sponsoring and encouraging activities, such as student government, a school newspaper, assemblies and special events. These activities also represent an effort to develop some measure of school spirit and pride.

WSHS emphasized the management objective of involving the staff totally in program decisions and allowing them maximum flexibility in their instructional programs and in instituting new programs.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The Work-Study High School enrollment capacity is approximately 260. Recruitment aims at juniors

and seniors, but sophomores occasionally are admitted. The recruiting is done by WSHS staff who supply information to Title I students about the program. Students who express an interest in attending are screened and, if eligible, referred by home school counselors and administrators. A student must be at least sixteen years old in order to attend.

WSHS conducts five vocational training programs in three basic vocational areas. These are automotive repair and small motor repair in the motor repair area, office skills and distributive education in the business area, and food services, which combines food preparation and service in one program. Extensive practice in shop classes and actual work experience in a part-time job are integral to the WSHS program. Also, courses in English, math, and social studies have been developed which relate specifically to each training program and these are a required part of that program. Credits acceptable for high school graduation and college entrance are given for all WSHS courses, including the field experience of the part-time job outside school. Credit for job experience is based on rating sheets submitted by the employers and on site observation by the work coordinator.

Each of the vocational areas is housed in a separate building which contains classrooms, a counselor's office, and shop areas which simulate a real job situation. Administrative offices and a Media Center are housed in a fourth building. The Media Center provides material in several media for both recreational and study purposes.

Students who attend WSHS are considered members of their regular schools, and they officially graduate from these high schools rather than from WSHS. However, successful participation in the WSHS program is formally recognized at graduation and students are presented a certificate signed by the WSHS principal and the Superintendent of

Schools. During the year, provisions are made for students to attend special events and participate in athletic programs at their regular schools.

At the time of this evaluation WSHS had only been in operation for a year and a half, but during the 1971-72 school year it will expand into a full two-year program which can accomodate both a one year and a two year curriculum. This will provide a course of work which can be completed in one year for seniors, and a two year course which juniors and sophomores can choose. In the case of sophomores, they would have to return to their regular high schools to complete credits needed for graduation. However, WSHS recruitment aims at juniors and seniors and sophomores are admitted only under special circumstances.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: Generally, the objectives set by the staff were met. Throughout the year there was a near capacity enrollment of students, sixteen or older, who came from schools with high drop-out rates. Of the total enrollment, 160 students were returning from last year and the remainder were new recruits. Thirty-one students dropped out of WSHS during the year and seventeen withdrew for non-drop-out reasons including health, movement to schools outside the city, and assignment to continuation schools. Twenty-four returned to their regular high schools, with most transfers occurring at the end of the first semester. Student absenteeism decreased significantly at WSHS, but tardiness increased.

Shop situations at WSHS are very good simulations of real work settings and afford excellent opportunities for practice. Students' progress is rated on an extensive checklist for specific skills and activities. Shop instructors indicated that students generally made adequate or above average progress in mastering the skills covered by the checklist.

Approximately ninety students were placed in outside jobs relevant to their vocational area. The work coordinator and distributive education teacher regularly visited their job sites and reviewed the quarterly reports submitted by the employers. These reports rated students' performance relative to responsibility, attention to duties, cooperation, interest, ability to work with others, and personal appearance. Most students received average to good ratings though some failed to adjust to job requirements. The work coordinator observed that students did best when the job challenged them and utilized the vocational skills they had learned. An objective for next year is to improve the quality of jobs obtained.

Students made good use of the media center as indicated by circulation records. Approximately 3,000 books were issued--about half for assigned work and half for recreational reading--and approximately 170 audiovisual items were used. All students who do not have work-study conflicts have 2½ periods each week formally scheduled in the media center.

Several supplementary activities were developed to promote school spirit and student identification with WSHS. These included assembly programs, publication of a school newspaper, the organization of a student government and limited social events. Provisions were also made for the students to return to their regular high schools for special events and for participation in athletic programs.

The administration and staff work together to identify and implement needed changes in the program. The internal harmony and close scrutiny of the program by the staff has provided a strong sense of direction for WSHS at this time.

The following recommendations were offered for the 1971-72 year: (1) identify a limited number of specific objectives which will be given special

attention in the coming year, (2) work with the evaluator in conducting follow-up studies on former WSHS students who have graduated from high school, and (3) begin to identify needed or desirable kinds of inservice training in anticipation of the opportunities which are likely to be available in the school system this year.

LINCOLN OPPORTUNITY HIGH SCHOOL

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 421

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES: Lincoln Opportunity High School is for students suspended from their regular high school for behavior which disrupted regular classroom proceedings, or their inability to succeed academically because of inadequate learning skills or motivation. Lincoln's task is to prepare these students to go back to their regular schools and to function productively there. The behaviors used as indices of the program's success with individual students are: (1) improved school achievement as reflected by improved grades and fewer failures, (2) greater interest in school as reflected by improved attendance, and responses to student questionnaires, and (3) improved behavior in school. These objectives were identified five years ago when the school was established and there has been no formal updating or revision of objectives since that time.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The designers of Lincoln for obvious reasons emphasized individualized diagnosis, prescription, and instruction for the students who would be attending there. They designed a school with a small enrollment capacity and a large professional staff of teachers, counselors, and social workers. Unfortunately, the school is housed in an old three story, concrete building that affords little privacy and no recreational facilities, neither indoors nor outdoors.

The Lincoln curriculum offers the same academic subjects taught at regular high schools, plus vocational subjects and work experience for which

credits can be earned. There is a maximum of twelve students per class.

The typical student at Lincoln is the problem student at other schools. According to their letters of suspension kept on file at Lincoln, students for 1970-71 were sent there because of academic failure, theft, drug abuse, intoxication, abusive behavior to teachers and other students, truancy--indeed a variety of reasons. They ranged from grades nine through twelve, though most were tenth and eleventh graders. The total enrollment was 421.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: The final evaluation of the 1970-71 program at Lincoln looked primarily at student attendance and achievement, and was based on an investigation of school records, analysis and studies of attendance data, achievement, and credits earned, responses from a questionnaire for Lincoln staff, and meetings with the staff.

Of the 421 enrolled, 178 were returned to their regular high schools during the year. Eighty-two are on record as having dropped out with "suspension" and "lack of interest" recorded as the major reasons. Sixty-six are recorded as withdrawn with "assignment to tutorial school", "physical health" and "sent to House of Detention" being respectively the most frequent reasons listed. Ninety-seven still remain in the program.

Students generally showed improvements in patterns of attendance while at Lincoln. Two mutally exclusive samples of 127 and 72 students were used for a comparison of the absences at Lincoln with absences prior to Lincoln. The comparison showed a mean reduction of 10.2 absences per semester. At Lincoln, the two samples had mean absences of 8.9 and 14.3 while prior to Lincoln

they had mean absences of 19.1 and 24.5 respectively. The two social workers on the staff share major credit for the improved attendance.

A limited follow up study was made on two groups of students recommended for return to their regular high school. One group returned in June, 1970, and another group returned in January, 1971. The performance of each student prior to Lincoln was compared to his post-Lincoln performance. As a group, the students who returned in June showed a statistically significant post-Lincoln improvement in grade point average, but still averaged less than a "D" letter grade. The January group showed no significant change in grade point average. Individual measures of IQ and Iowa Tests of Basic Skills were consistently unrelated to achievement, which would seem to indicate that the typical problems of these students are not cognitive ones.

There seemed to be no practical difference between achievement in the traditional academic subjects and achievement in art, music, physical education, and commercial and vocational education. No student received an excellent grade in the commercial or vocational areas and only seven of the fifty-six grades in these areas were above average. These results would seem to challenge the common assumption that vocational subjects offer a panacea for students who do not achieve well in the traditional program. However, students in the work-study program for high school credit were generally successful as judged by employers' rating sheets. Out of a possible score range of one (low) to twenty (high) the mean rating scores ranged from 12.2 to 13.3.

Feedback from the staff on the total program persistently confirmed the need for clarifying the direction of the program and reviewing the original objectives. The staff particularly questioned the wisdom of continuing to send to Lincoln students with severe psychological or psychiatric problems and students suspended for

drug abuse. With five years experience behind them, Lincoln teachers and counselors recognize they cannot meet many of the most pressing needs of these students, yet Lincoln's funding does not provide psychological or psychiatric staff.

This is the third year that the evaluation has recommended a review and clarification of objectives. This year it specifically recommended that at the very beginning of the coming school year the staff work with both the evaluator and appropriate administrators in order to establish specific goals and a plan for achieving them.

Additional recommendations were (1) to review the entrance procedures for students and obtain a suspension letter for each student (2) that professional psychological consultation be made more immediately available, (3) that each department assume responsibility for developing or identifying instruments for diagnosis and measurement of achievement, (4) that more stringent criteria be established for the return of students to the regular high school, and (5) that some effort be made to do a follow up study on students referred to the tutorial schools.

Five years ago Lincoln High School was given the task of modifying some of the most serious behavioral problems in the St. Louis high schools. Without minimizing the progress that has been made with many students, it must be recognized that the program is not functioning in line with the original objectives. Hopefully, a recognition of the discrepancies between the intended program and the actual outcome will lead to meaningful modifications based on the best data, the best judgment, and the best experience available.

MINI-GRANTS

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 2,910

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES: The Mini-Grant component provides small grants to individual Title I schools to aid faculties in solving their instructional problems and to provide demonstrations for other schools with similar problems. Both public and non-public Title I schools are eligible to receive grants.

Each school that applies for a Mini-Grant is required to develop its own objectives and evaluation plan. In this past year, public schools received grants for materials and equipment for remedial programs in arithmetic, reading, writing and language development. Non-public schools' Mini-Grants were for equipment and supplies for programs in reading, science, language arts, social studies and mathematics.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: In the 1970-71 school year, four public elementary schools and one public high school received mini-grants. Eighteen non-public schools received them.

The Mini-Grant program differs from other Title I programs in that grants are made to individual schools by the school system. All other programs are system wide and must be approved by the State Office of Education.

Public school grants are restricted to a maximum of $1,000. Non-public schools' maximum is based on the number of eligible Title I students in the school. Grants may be used to purchase instructional equipment and materials needed for new programs designed to meet an immediate

instructional need; however, they cannot be used simply to buy new equipment for the school or to supply furnishings or physical facilities for the new program. Also, only eligible Title I students may use the new materials. Equipment purchased by the non-public schools becomes the property of St. Louis public schools and is regarded as on loan to the non-public school.

Schools must follow the Guidelines for Mini-Grant Projects in applying for a grant. Applications are submitted first to District Superintendents, then to the Division of Evaluation and Research where they are rated by a review committee. Each proposal must state its needs and its objectives and outline an evaluation plan. It must also give the name, quantity, and price of all supplies, equipment, and materials to be purchased.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: Evaluations for public and non-public schools were done differently. Public schools were required to submit evaluation reports according to the evaluation plan submitted in their proposal. This was the basis of the evaluation of their program. Only one of the public schools submitted a thorough evaluation of its program. This program had concentrated on improving skills in reading and writing. For its evaluation, the written work and reading records of participating students were compared with the work of three control classes. It was evident that this program had achieved its objectives. Evaluation reports from other public schools stated that objectives were achieved but did not provide objective support for this statement.

The non-public school evaluation procedures consisted of visits to the school by the evaluator, administering questionnaires, and the use of standardized achievement test data. Test data was collected from selected schools where pre- and post-testing was completed.

In visiting the schools the evaluator found that the use of Mini-Grant equipment and materials was organized and managed in many different ways. Some schools had learning centers set up where students could work independently or in small groups with teachers or aides. At least 25% of the schools kept the Title I equipment and materials locked up for safety and teachers checked them out when needed. Another 25% of the schools kept the equipment in the classroom. At other schools all items were stored in resource centers where they could be used by students and also checked out by teachers. A persistent difficulty in all programs was the restriction of use. Students did not understand why a "privileged few" could see a film, use head sets, or have a book when others could not.

A questionnaire was sent to principals, teachers, and aides of non-public schools to learn of Mini-Grants operations. Responses were received from 109 of the 130 who had received the questionnaires. There was little difference between the responses from principals, teachers, and aides. In response to the question of how pupils were selected for participation in the program, 79 said teacher judgment, 63 said achievement tests, 53 said teacher test, and 34 said diagnostic tests. Other responses indicated considerable variation in the amount of instructional time for mini-grant programs and the amount of use of equipment and supplies. The majority of teachers spent four to six hours a week in the Title I program and reported that equipment and materials were used over half the time allotted for the Title I program in their school.

The non-public schools have no systematic process for standardized pre- and post-testing because of their shortage of funds. This makes it very difficult to evaluate achievement gains. The evaluator was able to obtain a limited number of

matched pre- and post- ITBS scores for fourth through eighth grades in nine schools. The scores did show some above average class gains in reading, arithmetic, and language but generally no inferences can be made regarding the effectiveness of Mini-Grants based upon this data.

The extent to which the objectives of the Mini-Grant program were met in 1970-71 was not determined by the evaluation. Schools receiving the grants said they were helpful and that disadvantaged students had made learning gains as a result of them, but there was little documentation of this claim. It is reasonable to believe that students would benefit from the type of equipment and materials provided by Mini-Grants just from the evidence of past experiences with these items. But if specific evidence continues to be required, then all schools receiving grants should make adequate provision for providing this evidence.

INSERVICE TRAINING

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES: There were two distinct inservice training programs conducted under the Title I inservice component. One was a massive program of workshops called Springboard, which was conducted in two phases--one in the spring and the other in August. The other program consisted of three district wide and six school level programs.

The spring phase of Springboard had four objectives. The first was to assess teachers' training needs. The next one was to provide teachers the diverse practical training which they had requested, including training directed toward personalizing and humanizing education. The other two objectives were to identify effective consultants for Title I inservice programs and to determine the direction for future training. The objectives of the August phase were to provide additional in-depth training, to identify potential in-house consultants and resource persons, and to make video tapes of workshops for future training.

Three district programs were planned to acquaint teachers and administrators with new material and equipment at district resource centers. The individual school program objectives varied with the needs of the schools, but generally the training was directed toward improving instruction in a variety of areas and with involving parents, students, and teachers in school problems and searches for solutions.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: Last year was the first time Title I funds were available to us for area-wide inservice training as a separate and distinct program. In the past, inservice has been tied into specific Title I programs. The change is representative of the

emphasis in teacher training which has developed in recent years as part of the solution to the problem of poor student achievement.

Given the flexibility which the separate funding afforded, we were able to assess the training needs of all Title I teachers and administrators and to involve them in the process of designing a training program. Early in the spring, teachers, principals, and district superintendents were canvassed to determine their inservice training needs. Teachers were asked to report their needs as teachers. District superintendents were requested to submit proposals for inservice programs needed at the district level. Principals were invited to submit proposals for school-wide programs.

The response from teachers was massive, indicating a diversity of needs ranging from better ways to teach basic skills to human relations training. The next step was to consolidate all these requests into a list of training needs and to submit this list to over 300 consultants who were invited to apply to conduct a one-day workshop that would respond to one or more of the needs on the list. They were asked to specify the objectives and the basic procedures they would follow in the training session. The consultants were drawn from the St. Louis school system, from regional labs, universities, Title III projects, and elsewhere.

Nearly 300 workshop designs were received. From these, 138 were selected to offer Title I teachers. The descriptions of these 138 workshops were published in catalogs and sent to the teachers for their selection. In this way, the teachers themselves chose which workshops would actually be conducted.

Nearly one thousand teachers and aides applied

for training and each one on the average requested to participate in four different workshops, so the duplicated count of teachers' requests for workshops totaled almost 4,000. However, many of the workshops were overwhelmingly chosen over the others, so that 111 workshops were actually scheduled. These were conducted on six successive Saturdays from April 17 through May 22.

Midway through the spring workshops, the consultants were invited to submit applications to conduct intensive follow-up workshops for Title I teachers in August. As soon as the spring workshops had been evaluated, nine consultants were selected and catalogs were again sent to Title I teachers in order for them to choose the workshops they wanted to participate in.

The nine August workshops provided training in (1) continuous progress in reading, (2) writing behavioral objectives, (3) using manipulative devices for teaching math, (4) communications skills, (5) differentiated instruction, (6) using the newspaper for teaching reading to reluctant readers, (7) applying learning theory in the classroom, (8) behavior modification, and (9) writing individualized multi-media packages.

Each of the nine August workshops was video-taped, and the tapes were condensed to two hour presentations. Consultants were asked to identify potential trainers among the teachers in their workshops, and district superintendents have been given the names of these teachers. The expectation is that those teachers, using the video-tapes, can serve as trainers within their own schools or within other schools of their district. The hope has been to develop and expand training resources within the St. Louis system in order to diminish the need for outside consultants.

On the district level, three districts planned inservice sessions in their resource centers to acquaint teachers and administrators with new materials and equipment.

The inservice sponsored by individual schools varied. Three schools brought parents, students, and teachers together to explore the problems at their schools and search together for solutions. Programs for teachers included recognition and correction of minor speech problems, the problems of teaching inner-city youth, techniques of managing groups within the classroom setting, the use of various media to stimulate interest in the classroom, and human relations training.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: The Inservice training programs of this spring and summer proved at least two things. One was that teachers' inservice training needs were numerous and diverse and secondly, that teachers were eager to obtain training.

Both the spring and August workshops conducted under the Springboard program were evaluated by questionnaires answered by participants. These questionnaires revealed that workshops generally had provided what the teachers wanted and that teachers had learned new skills which they intended to use in their classroom. There were few negative responses. These usually related to the length of the workshops--some said too long, some said too short. A few remarked that a workshop they were in was not what they had expected from the printed description of it.

The other purposes of Springboard were also met. We were able to assess the training needs of most Title I teachers. We were able to assess a number of consultants and programs, and to identify from among them resources for our

inservice needs. We were also able to use what we learned from the spring program in planning the August workshops, and in turn, will use what we gained from the total experience in extending inservice training through the Title I areas.

It is our intention to install inservice training as a natural and assumed part of the resources made available to Title I teachers. Springboard should be viewed as a first successful step in that direction.

Individual inservice programs at the school and district level were not entirely successful. Programs for teachers were well attended, but, unfortunately, participation in workshops involving parents in some cases was minimal. Those who did attend, however, indicated on a questionnaire that they felt the program was useful.

SUMMER SCHOOL

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 11,430

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES: A number of programs for Title I students and teachers were conducted during the summer of 1971. Summer school was conducted for elementary schools and high schools in four Title I districts. Inservice training was held for teachers in remedial reading and for Rooms of Twenty teachers. In addition, there were summer programs in Reading is Fun-damental, and for teacher aides in the Career Opportunity Program. The overall objective of elementary school was to improve skills in reading, language arts and arithmetic. The high school summer program offered courses students need most often to make up credits for graduation or move on to the next grade. The inservice training objective was to improve teachers' skills in remedial reading testing and teaching methods.

It was strongly recommended in last years' evaluation that summer school programs be designed around specific performance criteria. This was an objective for the 1971 summer program. District superintendents, school principals, and classroom teachers were asked to write behavioral objectives for their respective districts, schools and classrooms and to indicate the intended methods of measurements.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The summer school programs for elementary and high schools were held during the morning from 8:00 a.m. to 12:35 p.m. for seven weeks. In addition to the three regular Title I high schools, sessions were held for Lincoln High, O'Fallon Technical High, Work-Study High, the John Griscom School (Juvenile Detention Center) and for the Continued

Education Program for pregnant girls.

In all districts at the elementary level, classes were usually conducted in the traditional manner of teacher leading class. This was supplemented to a greater or lesser degree in the various districts by such activities as field trips, sports, arts and crafts, and music. The Reading is Fun-damental program which gives paperback books to educationally disadvantaged children was available in all Title I districts. A morning snack program began half-way through summer school once funds were available.

High school summer classes also were traditionally taught and consisted largely of regular courses needed for graduation.

Inservice training in remedial reading for regular classroom teachers was provided in four Title I district reading clinics. Remedial reading inservice for Rooms of Twenty teachers was held in an elementary school. Participants in each of these programs earned 10 credits from Harris Teachers' College. The format was similar. Each program lasted six weeks, and teachers spent part of each week receiving formal instruction and the other part in applying what they had learned with remedial students. The content of the programs varied. Inservice for Rooms of Twenty teachers was geared to the experienced reading teachers and to methods for working with individuals and very small groups. The reading clinic programs focused on what a regular classroom teacher would need to know about remedial reading and on acquainting these teachers with a variety of methods and equipment. Both programs emphasized administration and interpretation of diagnostic tests.

The Career Opportunity Program enabled teacher and work-study aides to take courses at local colleges or high schools. The aides worked for part of a day in the schools and attended appropriate classes

later. The purpose of this program is to help persons who want to become teachers in Title I schools.

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESULTS: The findings of the summer school evaluations were mixed. Many students obviously benefited. A total of 5,250 high school students earned 6,242 credits needed to graduate or advance to another grade level. Students at Work-Study High School were able to take courses they had not been able to take during the year because of work conflicts. Hundreds of elementary students from the inner city went on field trips to Grant's Farm, to Missouri Botanical Gardens' Arboretum and Nature Reserve, and to the Union Electric Company's camp and recreational area on the Meramec River. The students verified their enjoyment of these trips on questionnaires administered at the end of summer school. The morning snack program was another big hit with the children as indicated by their responses to the questionnaires. Also, according to teachers' comments on the questionnaires, for many of the students the snack was a valuable addition to their diet.

However, several problems were also evident. Chief among them were problems related to evaluating the educational gains made by the elementary students. Only one district designed pre- and post- tests to be used at all grade levels. In the other districts there was no formal pre-testing; some teachers administered pre-tests, and some did not. Some used standardized tests; others used teacher tests. As a result, evaluators had to rely almost entirely on classroom observations and questionnaires administered to principals, teachers, and students in randomly selected schools and classes.

In response to the questionnaire approximately 90%

of the teachers and principals indicated that they felt summer school had been successful and that they had achieved their objectives. Almost the same percentages of students indicated they had learned a lot. But in most cases there was no reliable data to indicate actual gains. In the case of high school students, the credits earned served as a measure of achievement.

Related to the problem of evaluation was the lack of definite objectives. At the beginning of the program district superintendents, principals, and teachers were requested to write performance objectives and indicate methods of measurement. All the superintendents and 96% of the teachers responded. Sixty-four percent of the principals did. Three difficulties were conspicuous in the majority of the responses. First, the objectives were not written in behavioral terms and consequently were too imprecise to measure adequately. Second, the objectives were too general and all-inclusive to be covered in the seven-week summer school period. Third, specific methods of measuring the objectives were not included, even though this is integral to developing performance objectives. It is apparent from this that the teachers and principals are not skilled in developing objectives in behavioral terms.

Although behavioral objectives is not a new educational concept, until recent years it has not been stressed. However, accountability requires the setting of realistic educational goals at the beginning of the program of instruction and demonstrating at the end of that program that these goals have been achieved. One positive aspect of the summer school experience is that many teachers were introduced to this process. For many of them, this was the first time they had been required to develop their own performance objectives. The fact that many of them had difficulty in developing specific, measureable objectives is less important than the fact that

they now are aware of the need to improve their skill in developing behavioral objectives. Many teachers already have requested inservice opportunities for this training.

Another problem was the instructional methods used for the elementary children during summer school. Evaluators observed that in most classrooms traditional materials were used and the teacher stood in front of the class talking and asking questions, and giving directions for student work. There were a few classrooms in which the teacher had planned innovative, enjoyable, and stimulating programs, but for the most part there was little or no attempt in the classroom to be innovative or to make summer school an enjoyable experience for the students. Evaluators also observed there was extremely poor daily attendance and a lack of student enthusiasm in these traditionally conducted classes. This runs counter to the Title I summer school purposes of attracting poor achievers and helping them to improve their learning skills or to catch up to their grade level. These students have not learned from traditional methods and materials during the regular school year and their use during the summer is inappropriate. There are materials and techniques which have been used with great success with disabled learners. Teachers of summer school should be acquainted with these materials and methods, and be provided the opportunity to learn to use them.

There were several other problems. One was dissatisfaction with the seven week summer school schedule. On the questionnaire 51% of the teachers and principals expressed a desire that the schedule be changed. There were also complaints that the 25 to 1 student-teacher ratio was too high. Possibly related to these two problems was the problem of some principals and teachers taking time off during summer school, with the teachers leaving their classes to whatever arrangements for substitutes the school could make. In a seven

week program this practice is particularly disruptive. Teachers who accept summer school positions should agree to teach for the entire program.

The following list of recommendations are made for the improvement of summer school in general and particularly at the elementary level.

1. Teachers desiring to teach in the summer school program should be required to participate in a special inservice training program prior to the beginning of summer school.

2. A special inservice program should be provided which includes writing performance objectives, determining appropriate measurements, and training in the use of innovative techniques and materials for disabled learners.

3. Traditional teaching activities should be replaced with a variety of innovative materials and techniques.

4. Teachers who accept summer school jobs should commit themselves for the entire summer school period.

5. One person should be appointed to organize and coordinate all Title I summer schools. If this is not possible, an alternate recommendation is that one person in each district be put in charge of all summer school in that district.

6. Summer school administrators should be appointed by their district superintendents much earlier. They should begin coordinated planning at least four or five months before summer school is to start.

7. The summer school budgets should be finally approved by May 1. However, contingency planning should have begun well in advance of that date.

8. The summer school schedule should be changed to six weeks with longer school days and a snack provided in the late morning.

The two specialized inservice training programs conducted for remedial reading and for Rooms of Twenty teachers were very favorably evaluated by the teachers who participated in them. On questionnaires they indicated they had learned a great deal about testing and teaching disabled readers. Pre- and post-tests administered to the participants also indicated an increased knowledge of remedial reading skills, diagnostic and prescriptive reading procedures, and use of new materials and techniques. It is recommended that training resources be made available to the teachers in these special programs on a permanent basis.